



Facilities Planning

Policy & Procedure # 37

TITLE: **ARCHITECT/ENGINEER RATINGS**

OBJECTIVE AND PURPOSE: To establish procedures for the evaluation of architects and engineers while under contract for continuing services for minor projects and major construction projects. Evaluation ratings are to be completed on a semiannual basis, in January and July. The firm must be under contract for a minimum of two months prior to being rated. An evaluation may be conducted at any time when a significant change in performance occurs.

RESPONSIBILITY **ACTION**

SENIOR PROJECT MANAGER ♦ Distributes evaluation forms to all Project Managers (including Engineering & Utilities) for major and minor projects (***Attachment "A"***).

PROJECT MANAGERS ♦ Completes evaluation form for each architect or engineer they have worked with during the evaluation period on major or minor projects, as per evaluation instructions (***Attachment "B"***). If an A/E firm is working on multiple major projects, a separate A/E evaluation form is to be completed for each project.
 ♦ Prepares supporting documentation for their evaluation to be discussed at a scheduled minor projects meeting.

FP DIRECTOR ♦ Conducts minor project meeting to determine a single, final rating for each A/E firm providing minor project services during the evaluation period.
 ♦ Reviews all major project evaluation forms for consistency of rating among PM's based on director's overall comprehensive perspective.
 ♦ Finalize evaluation forms and transmits both major and minor evaluation forms to the office of the University Architect & VP for Facilities (UAVP) for review.

UNIVERSITY ARCHITECT & VP FOR FACILITIES ♦ Review all ratings for University wide consistency.
 ♦ Forward approved ratings to Senior Administrative Assistant for logging into main database and A/E evaluation book.

UAVP ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT ♦ Record all ratings and maintain rating database.
 ♦ Transmit approved A/E ratings to Facilities Planning for further processing.

FP DIRECTOR ♦ Signs final A/E rating forms.
 ♦ Mail the completed evaluation form to the rated firm, certified mail, return receipt requested.
 ♦ Provide a complete set of all A/E rating forms to UAVP office.
 ♦ Track 30 day time frame for appeal process by rated firms.

Issued By: Richman/ Dashtaki	Date Issued: 8/2008	Date Revised:	Effective Date: 8/2008
APPROVED	Vice President	Assistant V.P.	Director

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES EVALUATION				BR-	N/A																							
University:	Florida Atlantic University	Date:																										
Project Title:		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Semiannual																									
Firm:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Project Closeout																									
Joint Venture:		<input type="checkbox"/>	Special (See Remarks)																									
Managing Office:	901 Ponce De Leon Blvd., Suite 900 Coral Gables, FL 33134	Project Manager:	Javier F. Salman																									
BASIC CRITERIA (Completed for all evaluations)		Rating Value	Weight	Extension																								
Quality of Technical Services																												
Firm Listed Above		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	9 *	= 0.0																							
<table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 40%;">Consultants:</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Specialty</th> <th style="width: 20%;">Rating Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Firm Name</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Mechanical Eng.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Electrical Eng.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Structural Eng.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Civil Engineering</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Consultants:	Specialty	Rating Value	Firm Name				Mechanical Eng.			Electrical Eng.			Structural Eng.			Civil Engineering								*Weight = 5 if consultants are used on project. Average = <input type="checkbox"/> X 4 =		
Consultants:	Specialty	Rating Value																										
Firm Name																												
	Mechanical Eng.																											
	Electrical Eng.																											
	Structural Eng.																											
	Civil Engineering																											
Timeliness of Service		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	4	= 0.0																							
Quality of Technical Documentation		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	3	= 0.0																							
Cooperation/Concern for SUS Interests		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	2	= 0.0																							
Administration of Project Paperwork		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	2	= 0.0																							
PART A (Completed when applicable)																												
Achievement of Study, Program, or Design Objectives		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5 **	=																							
PART B (Completed when applicable)																												
Administration/Enforcement of Contract Documents		<input type="checkbox"/>	X	5 **	= 0.0																							
**Note: If both Part A and Part B are used, the weight for each part will be 2.5 instead of 5.																												
				Total Weighted Points =																								
Numeric Rating				(Total Weighted Points/5) =																								
Overall performance during the rating period is evaluated as																												
REMARKS (Completed for all evaluations)																												
A design feature of the buried chilled water lines project was needlessly costly.																												
Note: Individual category rating values are assigned as whole numbers using the following scale. Outstanding = 4 Above Satisfactory = 3 Satisfactory = 2 Less Than Satisfactory = 1 Satisfactory, the benchmark rating, is defined as the level of performance that meets contract requirements. For more information, refer to CM-N-10.01-01/99			For The University: Director: Robert Richman Project Manager:																									

Attachment "A"

Professional Services Evaluation Form Instructions

Rating Criteria for Categories:

- A. Quality of Technical Services.** Documents the firm's ability to deliver technical services with a minimum of problems. Such problems may include mistakes in design or analysis, lack of thoroughness, lack of familiarity with codes, ignorance of contract document requirements, and, in general, deficiencies resulting from the lack or misapplication of technical skills and/or project specific knowledge that the firm is expected to have or to obtain. If the firm employs consultants, then the weight assigned this item is 5 and the "Consultants" section is completed. If the firm employs no consultants, then the weight assigned to this item is 9 and the "Consultants" section is omitted.
- B. Timeliness of Service.** Document the firm's ability to meet realistic schedules for the delivery of its services.
- C. Quality of Technical Documentation.** Documents the clarity, accuracy, and general utility of technical documentation produced by the firm. This documentation includes reports, drawings, specifications, sketches, renderings, promotional materials, and various other forms of documentation intended to communicate information about the project to the Owner or others. Such documentation may not be in final form. The fundamental issue is how well does the documentation accomplish its intended purpose.
- D. Cooperation/Concern for SUS Interests.** Documents the degree to which the firm cooperated with the Owner, and the extent of the firm's commitment to the protection and advancement of the interest of the SUS.
- E. Administration of Project Paperwork.** Documents the accuracy, timeliness of submission, and thoroughness of paperwork associated with the administration of the project. Such paperwork includes pay requests, additional services requests, status reports, change orders, and shop drawing review.

Part A. Should be completed when evaluating the programming phase or design/bidding phase of a project or for evaluating studies. Part A evaluates the overall effectiveness of the firm in meeting study, programming, or design objectives. This item specifically includes an appraisal of the firm's effectiveness in coping with budget limitations and scheduling work to be accomplished by others. It is not necessary that the study, program, or design be completed during the period.

Part B. Should be completed when a project is in the construction phase. Part B evaluates the overall effectiveness of the firm in administering and enforcing the contract during construction. This item specifically includes an appraisal of the firm's effectiveness in working with the contractor to bring the project to a timely completion, keeping abreast of progress status, detecting problems, providing direction to the contractor, inspecting the work, and following-up on punch list and warranty items.

Combined Part A/Part B Evaluations. In the event the evaluation period spans Part A and Part B phases, both parts should be rated and the respective weights will each be adjusted to 2.5.

Final Rating. The "Total Weighted Points" amount is divided by 5 to determine the 20-point based rating. This calculation is made because the score used in the past performance category of an architect/engineer selection is based on a 20-point scale. The overall performance descriptor is entered on the form, and is assigned as follows:

18 - 20	Outstanding
15 - 17.9	Above Satisfactory
10 - 14.9	Satisfactory
0.0 - 9.9	Less than Satisfactory

Ratings for Joint Ventures. Once evaluation is prepared for the joint venture, and a copy of the evaluation is sent to each party to the joint venture.

ATTACHMENT "B"